

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
08/319,411	10/06/1994	PETER NIELSEN	ISIS1158	8648
32650	590 10/06/2004		EXAMINER	
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP			MARSCHEL, ARDIN H	
ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		1631	

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		08/319,411	NIELSEN ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
	•	Ardin Marschel	1631			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication a		<u> </u>			
Period for I		,,,	•			
THE MA - Extension after SIX - If the per - If NO per - Failure to Any repl	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF ALLING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION in soft time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication, it id for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a red in thirty is specified above, the maximum statutory perion reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state or received by the Office later than three months after the mate at term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from tute, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠ R	esponsive to communication(s) filed on 20	July 2004.				
2a)⊠ Tł	nis action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) Ti	nis action is non-final.				
:						
Disposition	of Claims					
4a 5)	aim(s) 53,63 and 64 is/are pending in the order of the above claim(s) is/are withdraim(s) is/are allowed.  aim(s) 53,63 and 64 is/are rejected.  aim(s) is/are objected to.  aim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.				
Application	Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	eplacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre e oath or declaration is objected to by the	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	, ,			
Priority und	ler 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)□ . 1. 2. 3.	Certified copies of the priority docume Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicationity documents have been received and (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of	References Cited (PTO-892) Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) ⊠ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
3) 🔀 Informati	Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) on Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 b(s)/Mail Date ( <u>1 sheet)</u> .	_	atent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 08/319,411

Art Unit: 1631

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicants' arguments, filed 7/20/04, have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

## **OBVIOUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 53, 63, and 64 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 5,773,571. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of reasons of record and that the claim amending did not remove overlapping embodiments between the above instant claims and Patent claim. No argument was specifically set forth regarding this rejection. This rejection is

Application/Control Number: 08/319,411

Art Unit: 1631

necessitated by amendment which added new claims which cite limitations that overlap with those of the above Patent claim.

Claims 53, 63, and 64 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4, 5, and 7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,395,474. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of reasons of record and that the claim amending did not remove overlapping embodiments between the above instant claims and Patent claim. No argument was specifically set forth regarding this rejection. This rejection is necessitated by amendment which added new claims which cite limitations that overlap with those of the above Patent claims.

Claims 53 and 63 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,613,873. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of reasons of record and that the claim amending did not remove overlapping embodiments between the above instant claims and Patent claim. No argument was specifically set forth regarding this rejection. This rejection is necessitated by amendment which added new claim 63 which cites limitations that overlap with those of the above Patent claims.

No claim is allowed.

Applicants' amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Application/Control Number: 08/319,411

Art Unit: 1631

§ 706.07(a). Applicants are reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the Central PTO Fax Center. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993)(See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The Central PTO Fax Center number is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ardin Marschel, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0718. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, Ph.D., can be reached on (571) 272-0722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Legal Instrument Examiner, Tina Plunkett, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0549.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).